



AMERICAN FORK CITY COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 3, 2026
JOINT WORK SESSION MINUTES

Members Present:

Ryan Hunter	Council Member
Clark Taylor	Council Member
Staci Carroll	Council Member

Members Absent:

Bradley J. Frost	Mayor
Tim Holley	Council Member
Ernie John	Council Member

Staff Present:

David Bunker	City Administrator
Camden Bird	Assistant City Administrator
Terilyn Lurker	City Recorder
Ben Hunter	City Engineer
Derric Rykert	Community Services Director
Anna Montoya	Finance Director
Fire Chief	Aaron Brems
Fire Marshal	Mat Sacco
Heather Schriever	Legal Counsel
Cameron Paul	Police Chief
Sam Kelly	Public Works Director
Al Scott	Assistant Public Works Director
Cody Opperman	Planner
Annalisa Reed	Planner

Also present: Christine Anderson, David Bird, Rodney Martin, Claire Oldham, Cherylyn Egner, Ryan Wallace, Emily Seang, Lauren Leydsman, Mehrnaz Fereydouni, Alan Anderson, Alec Anderson, R. Kip Bromley, Kris Bromley, Brian Brown, George Brown, Jani Christensen, Don Michael Deveraux, JD Deveraux, Stewart Harmon, Amber Lamph, Collin Lambourne, Becky Olson, Jim Olson, Angela Plummer, Derek Rindlesbacker, Spencer Stevens

The American Fork City Council held a joint work session with the Planning Commission on Tuesday, February 3, 2026, in City Hall, located at 51 East Main Street, commencing at 4:00 p.m.

Mayor Pro Tem Taylor welcomed everyone to the meeting and excused Mayor Frost, who was out of town.

Mayor Pro Tem Taylor stated the proposed code changes and zone changes have been a hot topic, and he wanted to address some concerns. He commented that this process was not driven by an underlying desire to increase density or change the character of neighborhoods. The council was not intent on having more density in the city, and that the city has tried to put the density in corridors within the city that makes sense. The high-density housing has been by the frontrunner station, which location was not the city's idea. Mayor Pro Tem Taylor stated that the council members are also citizens and have the same concerns and frustrations the citizens have. This is a work session, where public comment is not taken; however, if time allows, they will entertain comments. There will be a public hearing at the Planning Commission meeting the following night.

Mayor Pro Tem Taylor noted this has been in process for about 18 months, with input from the citizens at various stages. This is the general plan for the city to try to shape the community. Hopefully, this discussion will give them clarity on what is taking place.

Mayor Pro Tem Taylor stated that multiple people have also brought up Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) to the council. While some may like ADUs, neighbors may not be as thrilled. They must make the best determination for the residence of the city as a whole.

Mayor Pro Tem Taylor wanted them to understand the character of people who have been involved with this process. He stated that the people he works with on the council do not have a personal agenda; they are trying to do what is in the best interest of the citizens of American Fork while meeting the requirements of the state.

1. Discussion on the proposal for the city's polycentric plan.

Patrick O'Brien stated this was a large-scale and long-range plan that will be coming forward in the future for adoption. He introduced Ryan Wallace, Emily Seang, Lauren Leydsman, and Mehrnaz Fereydouni from MHTN, who have been working with the city on this plan.

Ryan Wallace explained this plan was to bring development together throughout the city, and noted there were six nodes (or areas) throughout the city that they would go over.

Lauren Leydsman reviewed the schedule for preparing and adopting this plan. They started last July and have met monthly with the steering committee and core team to go over various issues. They are now starting to dive into the details. Ms. Leydsman pointed out the six nodes and where they are located throughout the city. The nodes include: "Transit" located in the TOD area; "Commercial" on the west side of the city north of the freeway; "Downtown" covers Main Street; "East Gateway" is on State Street on the east of the city; "Employment" which focuses on the area near the I-15 500 East exit; and "Recreation" around the boat harbor. Ms. Leydsman stated the guiding principles for the project are to create strong multimodal connections, vibrant mixed-use destinations, distinct identities and unified vision, quality of life and recreation, economic resilience and local business support, and strategic growth and implementation. They wanted a document that was implementable.

Mehrnaz Fereydouni explained they started with defining the vision to identify and assess transit scenarios to address the transit needs of the city, both short-term and long-term. She commented the FrontRunner was a great asset but was disconnected. For the long term, they looked at how to connect the different areas. The team then drafted goals based on the meetings they have had. There were key milestones in 2025 met for the transit study, including reviewing the existing

conditions, refining the needs and goals, holding agency partner meetings, and identifying short-term and long-term transit options. In 2026, the key milestones include evaluation of potential ridership, costs and benefits, funding and operations plan, and draft and finalizing the transit circulatory study. The team looked at the needs of the local community to better understand travel behavior, assessing the travel patterns to help them investigate what option would be best.

Ms. Fereydouni explained that a broad variety of scenarios were assessed, then refined and reduced based upon needs and goals. Further studies will take place to determine opportunities, constraints, and ridership potential. They will look at the on-demand service, realignment of existing routes to better serve activity centers, new service from FrontRunner to key destinations, and circulator route that serves many areas across the city.

Ms. Fereydouni then invited those in attendance to [menit.com](https://www.menit.com) where they could give their feedback as they went over the presentation. Some of the questions asked were:

What makes American Fork unique?

What should be celebrated?

In 10 years, what should people be saying about the polycentric city center as whole?

What would make transit usage successful in American Fork?

What is the most important thing you hope to see from this plan?

Something they should know or take into consideration when developing this plan.

Ms. Fereydouni stated the team has met with some in one-on-one interviews, as well as taking some observations from other communities. She went over the brand essence and vision for each of the nodes, encouraging the participants to share their thoughts on [menti.com](https://www.menti.com) on each of the nodes.

Transit Node

The Transit Node was connected, forward-thinking, urban, sustainable, and active. This was a connected, forward-thinking district centered on seamless mobility and urban livability. This is the link between regional movement and local community life.

Commercial Node

The Commercial Node was vibrant, convenient, dynamic, inviting, and contemporary. This commercial hub is a high-energy, convenient, and welcoming space. It is where regional access meets a polished, modern shopping and working environment.

It was asked if they could find moments in this node where they could make it walkable as opposed to driving between various locations. It was hard to make it all cohesive as it does take cooperation between landowners. Since people can get anything delivered to their door, they want to create a space where people go for an experience.

Downtown Node

The Downtown Node was authentic, historic, walkable, civic, and community-oriented. This was the authentic heart of American Fork where local culture, civic life, and small businesses thrive together.

It was noted that they need to take into consideration what UDOT was going to do with State Street. American Fork Main Street had good bones, which some communities lack.

East Gateway

The East Gateway Node was distinctive, welcoming, intuitive, and balanced. This was a distinctive gateway that announces the arrival into American Fork. It would be modern in terms of expression, grounded in heritage, and thoughtfully composed to serve both residents and visitors.

Employment Node

The Employment Node was productive, flexible, adaptive, innovative, and connected. This area was a productive and adaptable employment district that supports the city's economic vitality with efficiency, flexibility, and designed for the evolving workspace. They wanted to create a moment for those employees who come into the city where they can get something to eat, somewhere where they could stay and spend money.

Recreation Node

The Recreation Node is active, healthy, natural, restorative, and a destination. It is a shared landscape for recreation, wellness, and connection, where the city's natural setting supports active lifestyles and community life. It was noted this was down by the Boat Harbor were quite an investment was made and which was a distinctive offering.

Mr. Wallace stated he wanted to mention the shore to summit trail. They are seeing an opportunity for an active transportation system throughout the city for bikes and walking from the Recreation Node to the Downtown Node. He noted they would be looking for grants to assist with funding to make this a reality.

2. Discussion on proposed amendments to the city's municipal code.

Cherylyn Egner explained they wanted the input from the council on the zoning chart, as it is the council's decision on what is allowed. Mr. O'Brien commented they received feedback on the land use map and staff did go in and make changes; that map then dictates the location of the zones.

Ms. Enger noted they did put back in the RA-5 zone as there is a lot of agricultural protection. This was to avoid difficulties for those who have property in agricultural protection with all the same criteria that is currently in the city code.

Ms. Enger explained that the main goal of the proposed code re-write was to make it easier for people to find information, as well as to remove duplicates found in the current code. She noted the zoning is mainly found in Title 14, with building and construction in Title 15 that will apply across the board from single lots to subdivisions. Title 16 goes into the engineering side of development, where the standards and specifications manual will be pulled out of the current code and adopted separately.

Council Member Hunter stated that with RA-5 being added back in, and they had the conversation about pulling the R1-9000 zone. He asked how it would affect the citizens. Mr. O'Brien explained they looked at condensing the number of zones and making them more robust, however, by doing away with the R1-9000 zone, those already built would be legal non-conforming. The best thing for that issue was to rezone them into the R1-7,500 zone, which would allow the lots to still meet the requirements of the zone and would then be conforming. Council Member Hunter pointed out that it appeared to the residents that the city was trying to

increase density. Mr. O'Brien stated the intent was to simplify, but it opened this other problem of non-conforming lots.

Ms. Egner commented that there have been many discussions on this, but they have not been able to pin things down and there has not been much chance for the council and planning commission to give substantial feedback. If they wanted to see the R1-9,000 zone remain, they could add that back into the code.

Christine Anderson likes the idea of giving more options to the landowners. For instance, she was in favor of allowing people to subdivide if they want and allowing for flexibility.

Mr. O'Brien stated they needed to make sure the zoning was cohesive, and the land use map was the guiding document for that.

There was a short discussion on whether they should keep the R1-9,000 zone or leave it out. The council, planning commission members, and staff discussed property rights and how the zoning would affect neighborhoods. Concerns were expressed about removing the R1-9,000 zone.

Some zoning maps were put out on the table and those in attendance looked over those maps from 5:35 p.m. to 5:55 p.m. It was felt that the proposed zoning maps showing the exact boundaries needed to be prepared to make it easier to see the boundaries.

Mayor Pro Tem Taylor felt they still had work to do with the zoning, and Council Member John expressed his desire for more time to review the documents but felt they were heading in the right direction. The feedback received from the community would be helpful, and Mr. O'Brien noted all comments submitted would be available to the city council and planning commission.

It was noted that ADUs were be left out until after the legislative session was finished, which would allow staff time to look at any new state requirements.

Ms. Egner asked the council and planning commission to look at the map and the uses allowed. Included in the proposed code was a chart with the zones with the uses allowed in those zones. It was important for staff to receive feedback on the proposal.

Council Member Hunter felt it was important for the council to publicly state their opinion on whether they want to increase density. Council Member Hunter stated he had no desire to increase density above and beyond what already approved. Council Member Taylor agreed and noted he was not interested in converting more areas to high density where the traffic would be through residential areas. Council Member Carroll agreed and stated they have already approved the areas. It was noted that the infrastructure was built according to the zone, and if they start adding additional density, those lines will be inadequate.

Mr. O'Brien commented that the intent was to have this buttoned up by middle of February but wanted to discuss the timing of this with the council. Council Member Hunter loved that this was prioritized, but he wanted to make sure it was done right and that this did need to be looked at closely and be intentional.

Mr. O'Brien stated the planning commission would be holding the public hearing the following evening and he would get the comments to the council. He noted he had a great discussion with

Council Member Hunter, and he would be happy to meet one on one with any of the other council members or planning commission members. As they move forward, the proposed code re-write would need to go forward at the same time as the general plan and zoning.

Ms. Egner explained there were blanks throughout the code that would be filled in once everything is buttoned up.

It was noted that setbacks were a big concern for the citizens. Ms. Egner stated nothing they did was intended to drastically change things, and she tried to keep it consistent with surrounding neighborhoods and cities. The setbacks were in a table they could look at.

The council thanked Mr. O'Brien and Ms. Egner for their hard work on this.

3. Discussion on the PARC Tax policies.

Council Member Carroll stated a couple of months ago, the PARC Tax policies were brought up, with several areas that needed to be addressed. She wanted to go over six of the areas of concern that she would like the council feedback on.

The first was standardizing the format of project financial requests. The committee has created a financial template for organizations to use, but the question brought up was whether they were requiring all organizations to complete this form or only those organizations requesting a certain amount of money. Some of the smaller organizations would not have the same information and they did not want to disincentivize someone from applying. It was felt they should all use the same form, and if they did not have information for a specific section, they could make a note of that.

The second issue was the acceptance of late applications. Currently, the PARC Tax board is not accepting any late applications. However, the applications could be altered if they need additional information, if it isn't left blank on purpose. There are times that things are accidentally left off and that could be corrected. It was recommended they leave as is.

The use of expenditures for equipment as a qualified operating expense for Arts and Cultural programs. Council Member Carroll stated the board would recommend funding as a qualified program with certain conditions, such as the clear need for the equipment, explanation of how the equipment will be stored and accounted for within the organization, and that expenditures for private facilities or acquisition of land or construction projects on private facilities would not be allowed.

There was a discussion on whether they can ask for capital equipment back if the group folds or what could be done with assets that have been already purchased. One example was the stage that was purchased two years ago. The question was what they should do if another organization requests the same thing.

Council Member Carroll stated that one alternative was that they do not allow PARC Tax funds to be used on any capital expenditure. They then would need to define what a capital expenditure was. If capital expenditures were allowed, would they then need to catalog those purchases and how would those be cataloged and tracked? It was felt they needed to be consistent across the board.

It was noted that applications had not been turned in yet, so guidance could be given to the applicants.

Council Member Carroll noted she would tell the PARC Tax Board to go with their recommendation of the three criteria.

The third issue was the 70/30 split of funds. The PARC Tax board would like to continue to use their discretion. However, an alternative they are suggesting is to work toward the 70/30 split by a certain date while considering the benefits to the citizens.

Mr. Bunker noted that in past surveys, residents have said they want the 70/30 split.

The council members present felt they could support that recommendation. Council Member Hunter liked the idea of targeting 70/30 but did not think anyone would complain if it was not the exact percentage. He also noted that the council did have the discretion to change the disbursements if they see a need to.

Ms. Martin commented that she liked the split because it did give protection to the arts, so they aren't squeezed out. When they did the survey, it was very easy to see the recreational usage, but they don't always see the benefits of the arts usage.

Council Member Carroll stated the fifth issue was salaries and if they wanted to allow that in PARC Tax funding. The board was recommending some flexibility to recommend funding for administrative expenses, including salaries, under some conditions. Those conditions would be that the organizations will itemize administrative expenses in a format provided by the city which determines what expenses will be paid with PARC funds, limit the expense to 10% of the total funds awarded to the organization, and be less than \$80,000 per year. The other alternative is to not use salaries at all.

It was noted that there were organizations that were given funding for salaries in the past, and this would be a mechanism in reducing that. The council liked the idea of limiting it to 10% or \$80,000.

The last issue was performances held outside the city limits. The PARC Tax Board was recommending that they be given some flexibility under the following conditions: the organization demonstrates clear positive impact on city residents through attendance or participation in the program/performances, organization demonstrates efforts in obtaining venues inside the city limits and why it could not acquire those venues, the organization operate in the city even through the performances may be outside the city, the PARC tax funds are used for expenditures in the city which would include offices, warehouses, storage, or rehearsal spaces, and the performance are conducted in convenient locations to the city.

Council Member Hunter reminded them of the special needs swings that were turned down so they could fund an activity outside of the city; a citizen paid out of his own pocket to purchase that swing.

Ms. Martin explained this was brought up because the stage space is not great in the city limits. The schools have been known to kick out organizations at the last minute who have already

scheduled it. Council Member Carroll commented that there are organizations based in American Fork that perform here, but at times they do perform outside the city.

Ms. Martin asked if the board would have the leeway if they looked at the criteria. It was noted that ACT was an incredible steward of the funding received, but there were times they had to perform outside the city limits.

Council Member Hunter indicated he would be willing to approved expenditures outside the city if there were no other requests. Council Member Taylor pointed out there were also opportunities to obtaining funding from the other cities. Both Council Member Carroll and Council Member Taylor felt they needed to keep the funds in American Fork.

Council Member Carroll commented that she felt she had enough information to pass this along to the PARC Tax board and make necessary changes to the policies. It will be brought back for approval at an upcoming council meeting.

4. Adjourn

The work session ended at 7:00 p.m.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Terilyn Lurker". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Terilyn Lurker, City Recorder